## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/608,090	06/30/2003	Jean-Marie Bernard	004900-195	8126	
7590 10/11/2007 BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P. P.O. Box 1404			EXAMINER		
			SERGENT, RABON A		
Alexandria, VA 22313-1404			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1796		
				DEL MEDIA MODE	
		•	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			10/11/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/608,090	BERNARD, JEAN-MARIE	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Rabon Sergent	1796	

	Rabon Sergent	1796	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	orrespondence add	lress
THE REPLY FILED 28 September 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THI	S APPLICATION IN CONDITION F	OR ALLOWANCE.	
1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or or this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Not a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliant time periods:	wing replies: (1) an amendment, aff tice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in (	fidavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)
a) The period for reply expires 6 months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailin	g date of the final rejecti	ion.
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7	06.07(f).		
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orig r than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The appropri	iate extension fee ice action; or (2) as
<ol> <li>∑ The Notice of Appeal was filed on <u>28 September 2007</u>. F</li> </ol>	brief in compliance with 37 CFR 4	1.37 must be filed wit	thin two months
of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any repl	)), or any extension thereof (37 CF	R 41.37(e)), to avoid	dismissal of the
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,	but prior to the date of filing a brief	will not be entered b	ecance
(a) They raise new issues that would require further co	nsideration and/or search (see NO	TE below):	Coadso
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below		,,	
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in be	tter form for appeal by materially re	ducing or simplifying	the issues for
appeal; and/or	corresponding number of finally rei	inatad alaima	
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1		ected claims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1	, ,,	ampliant Amondment	(DTOL 324)
<ul><li>5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)</li></ul>		Impliant Amendment	(FTOL-324).
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a		timely filed amendme	ent canceling the
non-allowable claim(s).	iowabie ii sabiliittea iii a separate,	unicity med amendine	on canceling the
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 23-35 and 37-59.	☑ will not be entered, or b) ☐ wi vided below or appended.	Il be entered and an e	explanation of
Claim(s) rejected. 23-33 and 37-33.  Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>	It before or on the date of filing a North day the affiday and the affiday and the affiday are the second and the second are the second and the second are t	otice of Appeal will no vit or other evidence is	ot be entered s necessary and
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe y and was not earlier presented. S	al and/or appellant fai see 37 CFR 41.33(d)(	ils to provide a 1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attach	ned.
<ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet.</li> </ol>	it does NOT place the application in	n condition for allowar	nce because:
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
13. ☑ Other:		11	/
		Rabon Sergent	ent
		Rabon Sergent	

Primary Examiner
Art Unit: 1796

## **Continuation Sheet (PTO-303)**

**Application No. 10/608,090** 

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The proposed amendment raises substantially the same issues under 35 USC 112, first and second paragraphs, as set forth for "non-foamed polyisocyanates" within the final Office action.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Firstly, arguments based upon unentered amendments fail to constitute an adequate response to the issues at hand. Secondly, it is noted that applicants' response fails to address the rejection of claims 48 and 49 under 35 USC 112, first paragraph. Thirdly, depsite applicants' response, applicants have failed to establish that the prior art fails to inherently disclose the claimed polyisocyanates. In view of the fact that the reference employs the same reactants, applicants' response fails to conclusively establish that polyisocyanates of the claimed structure are not encompassed by the reference.

RABON SERGENT PRIMARY EXAMINER